

Determinism, Quantum Mechanics, experiments and true randomness

Ramon Lapiedra

Departament d'Astronomia i Astrofísica, Universitat de València, 46100 Burjassot, València, Spain.

A. Pérez

Departament de Física Teòrica and IFIC, Universitat de València-CSIC, 46100-Burjassot, València, Spain.

Can the ancient, philosophical concept of determinism, be formally translated into a scientific hypothesis, and finally be confronted with experiments? Are deterministic predictions, as expected, in contradiction with Quantum Mechanics, so that they can be quantified and eventually ruled out? After remarking that determinism and realism correspond to different concepts, we discuss these ideas in the present paper, and show an example where such contradiction appears. We consider a simple quantum system and its environment, including the measurement device, and make the assumption that the time evolution of this enlarged system is deterministic, i.e., its time evolution is given by a dynamical trajectory characterized by some initial conditions. Starting from the fact that the system responses are *reproducible*, and modulo the absence of any *conspiracy*, we prove a type of Bell inequalities in time, which are violated by Quantum Mechanics. We compare this result with similar previous results from other authors. We also discuss other types of proposed or past experiments, where determinism can be tested. We show how true random numbers could be obtained from the application of the above ideas.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 98.80.Jk

I. INTRODUCTION

Let us consider the time evolution of an isolated physical system, either classical or quantum. Does it always exist, as a matter of principle, a trajectory which, from some initial conditions, gives the values of the different quantities of the system during some finite duration of time, as it is, for example, the case in Newtonian mechanics, modulo some regularity conditions? This constitutes the concept of determinism in nature (sensibly different from the concept of realism, as we discuss later). As a matter of fact, determinism can be present under some circumstances, but the problem we want to address is whether determinism is *always* present *regardless of our capacity of prediction in practice*. Therefore, to discard determinism it suffices to find at least one example where it is contradicted by experimental data. This is what we are going to discuss along the present paper. Our claim is that determinism fails because it enters in contradiction with Quantum Mechanics (QM) and, maybe, with experiments.

Obviously QM, as described in standard textbooks, is an extremely successful non-deterministic theory, since the result of measurements can only be predicted in an statistical way. The best we can do is to consider an isolated quantum system, which will follow an unitary evolution, and ask ourselves about the result of a given measurement. Then, the rules of QM apply and only probabilities can be predicted (of course, if the quantum system is open, the situation is more complicated). This is the end of the story for QM: it is non-deterministic. To allow for some kind of deterministic behavior in quantum systems, one should depart from the standard formulation and introduce some sort of *hidden variables* that lie behind the quantum description, as in many alternatives

to QM, and explore its experimental consequences, as made in the literature.

There are two important points about determinism that must be discussed previously. The first one is the requirement that the system has to be isolated. As mentioned above, the evolution of open systems adds an extra difficulty to the study of QM, since the system becomes correlated with its environment, and its information is therefore degraded [1, 2]. Since we are going to assume determinism, we need to restrict ourselves to isolated systems. We will come back to this point later.

The second point relates determinism with realism, and the confrontation with experiments, in particular those experiments that evidence a violation [3] [13] of Bell inequalities [5] [6]. As it is very well known, this violation entails, modulo some loopholes [7], the failure of local realism, i.e. the NON existence of **local** hidden variables that claim for an objective reality beyond the quantum description. Of course, one could still assume the existence of some kind of non-local realism by giving up special relativity, an unrealistic assumption that would raise tremendous experimental and theoretical problems. An even weirder idea is the suggestion by Bell [8] that we could rely on a vast *conspiracy* which would arrange the causally unconnected hidden variable values in order to produce the correlations, between the two particle measurement outcomes, which are responsible for the observed violation of Bell inequalities.

Going on with this second point, in this paper we explore an idea which differs from realism, can be discarded by past experiments or by some other proposed experiments, and is based on testing some *time Bell-like* inequalities derived from determinism. As shown in the next Section, we can find some scenarios in which determinism enters in contradiction with QM. The reason why

the violation of usual Bell inequalities can be reconciled with **non local** realism, while our time Bell-like inequalities cannot be reconciled with determinism, is that the deterministic assumption is a stronger condition than realism. More precisely, realism postulates the existence of some hidden variables values behind the outcome of a performed measurement, *without requiring that these hidden values remain the same after performing the measurement*. On the contrary, the deterministic assumption postulates the existence of the same *standing* hidden variable values (the unknown initial conditions) behind *all* the successive self-responses of the *isolated system* along a certain finite time, this isolated system including at least the measurement device besides the measured system.

Similar results to the ones reported above have been previously obtained by De Zela [10] by *adding* to the deterministic postulate a *non contextuality* condition, which amounts to saying that initial conditions and measurement directions are uncorrelated. But this condition becomes specially unjustified when determinism is assumed, since then these directions depend on the initial conditions. In the present paper, we propose a kind of experiment for which determinism by itself does not entail contextuality. Furthermore, we do not need to impose any other condition, out of an unavoidable one: the non existence of the above quoted *conspiracy*. This condition is always present, sometimes implicitly, in the proofs of ordinary Bell inequalities, and also in the referred case of [10].

On the other hand, we stress the fact that our Bell-like inequalities apply to any system, microscopic or macroscopic, provided that it has dichotomic and *reproducible* responses, and that determinism is assumed for some *enlarged* isolated system. Using all this, we propose some new experiments to test determinism, and analyze how past experiments can be used for such a test. We discuss the possibility of obtaining successions of true random numbers from them.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sect. II we discuss a very simple quantum system (a spin 1/2 particle), we define its corresponding *enlarged* system and introduce the deterministic assumption for this enlarged system. We specify suitable conditions under which the experiment should be performed, and prove some time Bell-like inequalities for consecutive measurements. We show that QM violates these inequalities, which implies that determinism and QM are incompatible. We compare this result with previous ones from different authors. In Sect. III we explain how performed experiments violating the CHSH inequalities can be reinterpreted as providing a violation of our Bell-like inequalities. According to our interpretation, these experiments already exclude determinism.

Finally, in Sect. IV, we suggest other scenarios, either microscopic or macroscopic where, under the assumption of determinism, our time Bell-like inequalities apply and can be experimentally tested to disprove determinism.

We also discuss how, in some circumstances, this refutation could be used to generate successions of true random numbers, thus improving previous claims by precedent authors which, in our opinion, were incomplete.

II. DETERMINISM AND THE VIOLATION OF TIME BELL-LIKE INEQUALITIES

We start with a large ensemble of free spin 1/2 particles numbered by $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$, all of them prepared on some quantum state, and consider the following ideal experiment: we first fix a set of three space directions given by the unit 3-vectors $\vec{a}$, $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{c}$. Then, on each particle we perform two successive spin measurements along two randomly selected directions out of this set: We prepare one particle and make two consecutive measurements, then prepare the next particle, reset time to zero and proceed in the same way, etc ...

These "free" particles could evolve interacting, to some extent, with their environment in an uncontrollable way, and will certainly interact with the measurement apparatus. The latter includes the device that randomly selects the two measurement directions out of the three initially fixed directions. Consider now the physical system that includes the particles to be measured, the experimental facility and the interacting environment. We will refer to this system as the *enlarged system*, hereafter represented by E , and will assume that such system can be considered as an isolated system, at least during two consecutive measurements. This is the usual starting point in the study of open quantum systems [1, 2] (where "open" refers here to the measured particles).

We now define our notion of determinism following what happens, for example, with Newtonian determinism (where, aside from some "pathological" cases, the initial position and velocity, i. e., the initial conditions, allow us to know some piece of the trajectory of a particle). We will make the corresponding deterministic hypothesis for the enlarged system E . Then, not only the successive spin measurement outcomes, $\pm\hbar/2$, are determined from the initial conditions, but also the successively selected measurement directions are determined too, whatever the selection mechanism is. Notice that we do not impose any restrictions on the assumed initial conditions: In particular, they could range over non causally connected space-time regions.

Let us be more precise about our enlarged system and the measurement process. Let us denote by λ the initial conditions that we postulate to exist, complementary to the prepared state of the quantum description, but leading to the same predictions than this quantum description. These initial conditions will belong not only to the particle, but to the whole system E . Imagine that, each time we prepare our spin 1/2 particles, system E starts from different initial conditions, i. e., different λ values. We will perform two consecutive spin measurements on each prepared particle. These two consecutive

spin measurements will be performed at two randomly selected times, out of three fixed values t_1, t_2 , and t_3 relative to the preparation time (which is always reset to zero). To each selected time, t_1, t_2 or t_3 , we associate a constant measurement direction, $\vec{a}, \vec{b}$ and $\vec{c}$, respectively. In other words, we originally establish a given correspondence $\{t_1 \rightarrow \vec{a}, t_2 \rightarrow \vec{b}, t_3 \rightarrow \vec{c}\}$ and keep it unchanged during the measurement process for the entire set of particles. Thus, the randomness in the direction selection arises only as a consequence of the randomness in the selected pair of times out of the set $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$. The device (hereafter referred to as P) that selects the pair of times, (t_1, t_2) , (t_1, t_3) or (t_2, t_3) (and so the choice of the pairs of measurement directions) could, in fact, be a pseudorandom generator, as long as the statistics it provides for this selection is close to a true random one. In the present paper, it is assumed to be previously manufactured (it could simply consist on a deterministic pseudorandom computer program), and is included into the experimental setup prior to the starting of the experiment: prior to the entire succession of measurement pairs. It will start producing the mentioned pairs from a “seed” defined by a set of parameters which we represent by the initial condition Λ . The introduction of this deterministic selection device, P , which is working independently of the rest of system E , will be a crucial point all along the present paper.

Then, denote by S the values of the particle measurement outcomes, which are conveniently normalized to ± 1 . According to the determinism postulate for our enlarged system, there exists a function (unknown to us) which provides those outcomes for each value of time t_i , starting from the initial conditions, i. e., the parameter values λ . Let us represent this function by $S = S(\lambda, t_i, \vec{x}(t_i))$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, with $\vec{x}(t_i) \in \{\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \vec{c}\}$. Notice that this notation for the function S is actually redundant: according to the above discussion, once we have fixed λ and t_i , the value of S becomes determined, therefore we could drop the argument $\vec{x}$ in S , although we will keep it for convenience in the following discussion.

We now follow the original proof of usual Bell inequalities [5] in order to arrive to similar inequalities for our consecutive measurement outcomes. Let us consider the following three expectation values:

$$P(a, b) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}), \quad (1)$$

$$P(a, c) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c}), \quad (2)$$

$$P(b, c) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c}), \quad (3)$$

where $\rho(\lambda)$ stands for a the probability distribution of the λ values, which satisfies $\int \rho(\lambda) = 1$.

As we show below, in order to arrive to Eqs. (1-3), we need to have in mind that the selection of the successive direction pairs is performed according to some deterministic device, P (working as a pseudo-random generator). The reason why we will need it in order to arrive to Eqs. (1-3) is that our deterministic system dynamics could correlate, say, the pair $\{\vec{a}, \vec{b}\}$ of measurement directions to a set of particular values of the λ variables. We name this hypothetical subset $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, and similarly for $\{\lambda_{ac}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{bc}\}$, respectively. Consequently, in an evident notation, we would have three different probability distributions, ρ_{ab} , ρ_{ac} and ρ_{bc} , instead a unique one, $\rho(\lambda)$, as in Eqs. (1-3). Following these ideas, one then should write

$$P(a, b) = \int d\lambda \rho_{ab}(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}). \quad (4)$$

$$P(a, c) = \int d\lambda \rho_{ac}(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c}). \quad (5)$$

$$P(b, c) = \int d\lambda \rho_{bc}(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c}), \quad (6)$$

instead of (1)-(3). In other words, we would have three different probability spaces (one for each subset $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, $\{\lambda_{ac}\}$, $\{\lambda_{bc}\}$) instead of a common probability space for the three expectation values $P(a, b)$, $P(a, c)$, $P(b, c)$.

But, can the set of initial conditions, $\{\lambda\}$, really split into three, perhaps overlapping, subsets $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, $\{\lambda_{ac}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{bc}\}$ (with corresponding probability distributions), as a consequence of the deterministic assumption, or can we alternatively assume *non contextuality*, that is $\{\lambda_{ab}\} = \{\lambda_{ac}\} = \{\lambda_{bc}\} \equiv \{\lambda\}$ with a common probability distribution, despite determinism? Let us see why, in our case, determinism by itself does not imply *contextuality*, i.e. it does not imply $\{\lambda_{ab}\} \neq \{\lambda_{ac}\} \neq \{\lambda_{bc}\}$:

First, remember that the two consecutive measurement directions of the pair $(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ on the n th particle are applied at the consecutive corresponding times, say t_x and t_y , counted from the corresponding initial time t_n , reset to zero for each particle n . To this initial time, t_n , it corresponds some initial condition λ , say λ_n . Now, let us invoke the basic “principle of causality”, according to which the future cannot affect the past. Then, an action (the $\vec{x}$ or the $\vec{y}$ measurements on the particle) that is performed at t_x or t_y , respectively, that is, after the initial time, cannot influence what was present for the particle in this previous initial time: In other words, it cannot influence the corresponding initial condition λ_n . Thus, as we wanted to show, this kind of action could never lead to the above hypothetical splitting.

However, this is by no means the end of the story, since perhaps things could go the other way around: we mean that, perhaps each λ_n , let us say $\lambda_{n(xy)} \equiv \lambda_{xy}$ is responsible, at least partially, for the ulterior two consecutive measurements being just performed in the $(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$

directions, thus finally splitting the set $\{\lambda\}$ into the three subsets $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, $\{\lambda_{ac}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{bc}\}$. But this loophole cannot work since, by construction (by the deterministic character of P), $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$ are functions of time and of the UNIQUE initial condition Λ , and so cannot depend on λ . In other words, the selecting device P and the initial conditions λ are **uncorrelated** in our setup.

All in all: the different kinds of measurement actions cannot be correlated with the different initial conditions λ , as we wanted to prove.

There is still, in the above reasoning, a subtle difficulty to comment: perhaps the different initial conditions λ never repeat completely themselves, such that the three hypothetical subsets, $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, $\{\lambda_{ac}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{bc}\}$, cannot achieve an standing equality $\{\lambda_{ab}\} = \{\lambda_{ac}\} = \{\lambda_{bc}\}$, which would prevent us from using the above argument to prove that determinism, by itself, does not lead to contextuality. Nevertheless, this hypothetical inequality would not be a problem, since what is physically relevant are not the, for example, λ_{ab} values by themselves, but the corresponding function values $S(\lambda_{ab}, t_1)$, entering in the expectation value $P(a, b)$, in (4). Then, remember the "reproducibility" of the measurement outcomes, meaning by this that, in accordance to QM, those expectation values reach standing values for a sufficiently large number, N , of measurement pairs. This implies that, beyond N , we still could formally write $P(a, b)$ in (4) using the same finite subset, $\{\lambda_{ab}\}$, that we have used just for N . Thus, in practice, because this "reproducibility" principle, (which, in the present case, can be taken as an experimental fact) we can use a finite number of λ_{ab} values, and the same for the λ_{ac} and the λ_{bc} , to avoid our initial difficulty. As a result, we still can use the above argument in favor of non contextuality in spite of the deterministic assumption.

But, even admitting the impossibility of the above splitting action driven by the deterministic postulate, it could be still possible that the dynamics of system E is originally arranged in such a way that the values of the λ variables are *effectively* correlated with the measurement directions because of the above possibility, raised by Bell, of an initial *conspiracy*: Hence we necessarily would have to write (4-6), instead of (1-3), in the absence of a common probability space. One can, in fact, *design* a *deterministic device* (or a computer program), in the sense that determinism is defined in the present paper, that incorporates *ad hoc* such correlations, even the kind of correlations needed to simulate QM, under the form of convenient distribution functions ρ_{ab} , ρ_{ac} and ρ_{bc} . Consequently, it is easy to see that one could not go on and obtain the desired time Bell-like inequalities in such a case. At this point, we have to stress that we are in a similar position to **any** derivation of usual Bell-like inequalities, including the ones derived in [10], where this *conspiracy* has always to be ruled out, in order to complete any of these derivations.

Let us come back once more to the "reproducibility" question. In the experimental setup described above,

Eqs. (1-3) are understood as an statistical average over a large number of particles. Each pair of measurements is in correspondence, within our scheme, with some value λ . A comparison of these formulae with the experimental results only makes sense if the set of λ values "accessed" by the whole experiment is assumed to be *statistically representative* of the whole set. Of course, in our case, where the *enlarged* system, E , includes the experimental set up and beyond, one might argue that the space of hidden variables is so large that one could never achieve a representative subset of the total, in which case no comparison with the experiment would be possible. However, in spite of this large size, we have, according to QM, well defined expectation values $P(x, y)$. Thus, we can assume that, after a sufficiently large number of measurements, we achieve some sort of saturation for expressions Eqs. (1-3). That is, a further increase in the number of measurements will not significantly change the result and the same experiment, repeated under different initial conditions, will reproduce the same results: we insist, this is just what happens with our setup according to QM predictions. However, this is what has to be secured to happen from the beginning in the macroscopic cases commented in section IV.

We think that it is important to have made explicit the postulate of ruling out the *conspiracy*, the observed (at least in accordance with QM) "reproducibility" of the measurement outcomes, and the incorporation of the deterministic P device to select the successive measurement directions, as prerequisites to arrive to Eqs. (1-3) in order to test determinism. It is important because, otherwise, the reader could object from the very beginning that we should never be able to find a contradiction between experiments and unrestricted determinism, and then to conclude that something has had to go wrong in the present paper with the claimed prediction of such a contradiction. The reader might rise this objection because it seems intuitive that unrestricted determinism could always be initially arranged so as to fulfill any subsequent behavior of the system.

In all, while the derivation of usual Bell inequalities assumes local realism, we will use here determinism to derive our time Bell-like inequalities. Nevertheless, in both cases we also need to rule out any *conspiracy*. A natural assumption that, henceforth, we will take for granted, in accordance to what is an usual practice in the literature on the subject.

Let us go on with the derivation of our time Bell-like inequalities. We take the difference

$$P(a, b) - P(a, c) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) \quad (7)$$

$$\times [S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) - S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c})]. \quad (8)$$

Henceforth, the proof of the inequalities goes along the same lines as the proof of the original Bell inequalities in Bell's seminal paper [5]. First, since $S^2(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) = 1$, the above difference can be written as

$$P(a, b) - P(a, c) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S(\lambda, t_1, \vec{a}) S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) [1 - S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c})]. \quad (9)$$

Then, taking absolute values, we are led to

$$|P(a, b) - P(a, c)| \leq \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [1 - S(\lambda, t_2, \vec{b}) S(\lambda, t_3, \vec{c})], \quad (10)$$

that is, to the well known Bell inequality

$$|P(a, b) - P(a, c)| \leq 1 - P(b, c), \quad (11)$$

now referring to two consecutive measurements on the **same particle**.

In QM, leaving aside the experimental difficulties to perform the kind of experiment we are considering (see [10] for some sound proposals), the three mean values in (11) can be theoretically calculated as the corresponding expected values. These values become $P(a, b) = \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$, irrespective of the spin particle state prior to the first measurement (see for instance [11]) and similarly for $P(b, c)$ and $P(c, a)$. Thus, inequality (11) becomes

$$|\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{c}| + \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} \leq 1, \quad (12)$$

which is violated for $\vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} = 0$ and $\vec{a} = (\vec{b} - \vec{c})/\sqrt{2}$, in which case the left hand side of inequality (12) reaches the value $\sqrt{2}$.

Thus, for the enlarged system consisting on 1/2-spin particles and the measurement apparatus, including the device selecting, once for ever, the time pairs and the corresponding measurement directions, plus the affecting environment if any, the assumed determinism enters in contradiction with quantum mechanics. In other words, the essence of the present paper is the following: could we consider **any system** E larger than the particle under study, so as to encompass the measurement device, perhaps the laboratory and even beyond, in order to attain an enlarged system whose evolution fulfills the deterministic assumption? Our claim is that, if the appropriate measurements were performed and inequality (11) was found to be violated, as we expect from QM, then, no matter how large E was assumed to be, the answer to this question would be negative.

At this point, it is interesting to compare our result with a similar one stated in [12]: there, under the following three postulates, *macroscopic realism per se*, *noninvasive measurability* and *induction*, Leggett derives some Clauser-Horn-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequalities [6][8], relating the successive outcomes of a system with random dichotomic responses against four types of measurements. Our determinism postulate entails macroscopic realism per se and the induction postulate, and also noninvasive measurability *for the enlarged system* (the spin 1/2 particles plus the environment including the measurement

device). Thus, a difference between Leggett's approach and ours is that we replace the dubious non-invasive measurability by a more clear postulate as determinism for the isolated enlarged system, which does not entail non-invasive measurability for the measured system.

III. REINTERPRETING PAST EXPERIMENTS

In the last section, we considered a perhaps performable experiment to derive some time Bell-like inequality (11) in order to test determinism, and we have referred the reader to the experiment proposed in [10]. Actually, there are many experiments already performed for which inequalities similar to (11) can be proved under, essentially (see below), the determinism hypothesis. The results of most of these experiments entail the violation of these inequalities and, so, the failure of determinism.

In order to show this, let us consider the standard ideal situation where we have a system of two entangled spin 1/2 particles, say particles A and B (although most of these experiments have actually been performed measuring photon polarizations: see, for example, [13][14] and references therein). We prepare many times the system in the same state, and each time we measure simultaneously both spins in two directions $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$, respectively: $\vec{x}$ is randomly chosen out of the two directions $(\vec{a}, \vec{a}')$, and similarly for $\vec{y}$ from $(\vec{b}, \vec{b}')$. We will denote as S_A and S_B the corresponding outcomes, that is $S_A = \pm 1$ and $S_B = \pm 1$. Now, let us assume local realism (plus, obviously, the absence of *conspiracy*, although we will not mention it anymore). Then, we can write the functions $S_A(\lambda, \vec{x}) = \pm 1$ and $S_B(\lambda, \vec{y}) = \pm 1$, with λ standing for the assumed local hidden variable values. Thus, similarly to Eqs. (1-3), we can write for the present expectation values, $P(x, y)$,

$$P(x, y) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) S_A(\lambda, \vec{x}) S_B(\lambda, \vec{y}). \quad (13)$$

As it is well known [8], this particular way of writing $P(x, y)$ leads, in a straightforward way, to the above CHSH inequalities

$$|P(a, b) - P(a, b')| + |P(a', b) + P(a', b')| \leq 2. \quad (14)$$

Now, imagine that the two measurements of each measurement pair are no longer simultaneous: instead we first measure the A particle and then B . Furthermore, imagine that we are not making sure that both measurement events are in a mutual space-like configuration. Under these circumstances, it could be dubious whether we must assume locality or not, which means that we could not conclude the above CHSH inequalities. But, alternatively, we could assume determinism for the two particle system, in a way analogous to the one described in Section II. Notice that the present experiment outcomes are also "reproducible" in the specific sense given to this word in that section. Then, we can write the expression (13),

where now λ does not stand for the values of some hidden local variables, but for the values of the initial conditions of the assumed determinism for the two entangled particle system. Furthermore, as explained, above, once we have written $P(x, y)$ as in (13), the CHSH inequality follows directly. But most of the reported experiments [13] [14] violate these CHSH inequalities. Thus, we must conclude that the experimental failure of determinism would actually have been confirmed long time ago. Of course, in these experiments, we do not know if the successive choices of the measurement directions have been performed according to an initial deterministic pseudorandom procedure as the one, P , described in Section II (remember that using a selection procedure like P was necessary to conclude the derivation of our time Bell-like inequalities (11)). However, we can make the assumption that the final result of these experiments [13][14] does not depend on the kind of pseudorandom procedure, deterministic or not, that has been used. We can assume it, knowing that, although very unexpected, it would be extremely interesting by itself, to finally find out that this assumed independence was actually untrue.

IV. SOME OTHER TESTS, TRUE RANDOMNESS AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is to be noticed that inequality (11) could be applied to any system, macroscopic or not, with a random dichotomic response to three possible kinds of consecutive measurements (only a consecutive pair of these three measurements being randomly selected each time), provided that determinism is assumed for the time evolution of the corresponding enlarged system, and "reproducibility" (see Section II) becomes verified. Looking for a possible violation of this inequality could lead to test determinism in the macroscopic world, beyond the microscopic cases considered in the previous Sections, which have been tested experimentally and confirmed the predictions of QM.

Moreover, we could also consider any source producing random successions of numbers, as for example the ones originated from quantum devices [15]. It is generally stated, according to standard criteria, that these numbers are "true random numbers". Beyond this statement, it would be interesting to test it by investigating the possible violation of the corresponding time Bell-like inequalities that could be deduced under the deterministic assumption, since a hypothetical violation of them would entail the true randomness of the corresponding succession.

Finally, in order to stress the point of making the distinction, made in the present paper, between determinism and realism, we consider the case presented in [16], where it is claimed that 42 random numbers have been generated from the measurement outputs of a system of two entangled atoms. We think that the claim is correct and very interesting but, in our opinion, not correctly

established. Its pretended proof relies on the observed violation of the corresponding CHSH inequalities [6]. As it is recalled in the previous section, these inequalities are proved under the assumption of local realism. This means that the claim about randomness depends on the supplementary assumption of locality, which means that the observed outputs could still be predetermined (and then actually be non random), if non local realism is allowed.

To consistently prove that these 42 numbers are actually random, we should previously prove the CHSH inequalities under the assumption of determinism for some isolated enlarged system, whose initial conditions, as seen in the present paper, are completely general, i.e., local or non local. But this new proof of CHSH inequalities for consecutive measurements has just been performed in the previous section. Only using this new proof can we properly conclude that the reported violation of the CHSH inequalities in [16] really shows the true random character of the obtained 42 numbers.

To end up, if we mean by "trajectory" something more than a simple continuous path, even a zigzagging one, to require the existence of determining initial conditions for E , the enlarged system, and we further accept QM, it seems that there is no room left "for models that force Nature to mimic the concept of trajectory" as it is still expected in [17]. In other words, it seems that henceforth we will have to renounce to include the spin particle into an enlarged system whose dynamics would be deterministic, and also to any deterministic explanation of the quantum wave collapse, for example the kind of collapse described in [18].

To summarize: according to the above discussions, either Quantum Mechanics, or determinism (as defined here), must be false. So, if we accept QM, in view of its great success, or we interpret some fulfilled experiments from the point of view described in Section III, we must conclude that determinism would contradict experiments. Then the answer to Leggett's question [12] "it is indeed realism rather than locality which has to be sacrificed?" would be "yes", although what has actually failed here is determinism, an assumption which is stronger than realism. All in all: against Einstein's old dream, it seems that QM cannot be completed to the extent to allow for the existence of trajectories for quantum particles, even when accounting for all its affecting environment.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación e Innovación, MICIN-FEDER project No.FIS2009-07705, and by Projects FPA2008-03373 and "Generalitat Valenciana" grant PROMETEO/2009/128. R. L. also thanks Dr Michael Hall for having made a number of useful critical comments to the manuscript,

and Prof. Eliseo Borrás for his reading and comments. Useful discussions with A. Palacios-Laloy are gratefully

recognized.

-
- [1] H.P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, Academic Press, (1994).
 - [2] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, World Scientific, (2008).
 - [3] A. Aspect, *Nature*, 398, 189 (1999).
 - [4] M. A. Rowe et al., *Nature*, 409, 791 (2001).
 - [5] J. S. Bell, *Physics*, 1, 195 (1964).
 - [6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 26, 880 (1969).
 - [7] E. Santos, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 36, 544 (2005).
 - [8] J. S. Bell, *Journal de Physique*, Colloque C2, supplément number 3, 42, 41 (1981).
 - [9] D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.*, 85, 166 and 180 (1952).
 - [10] F. De Zela, *Phys. Rev.*, 76, 042119 (2007).
 - [11] R. Lapiedra, *Europhys. Lett.*, 75, 202 (2006).
 - [12] A. J. Leggett, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 71, 022001 (2008).
 - [13] M. A. Rowe et al, *Nature*, 409, 791 (2001).
 - [14] R. García-Patron Sánchez et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93, 130409 (2004).
 - [15] Quantum Random Number Generator. Available at <http://qrbg.irb.hr>.
 - [16] S. Pironio et al., *Nature*, 464, 1021 (2010).
 - [17] A. Suarez, arXiv:0801.3050v1.
 - [18] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, *Phys. Rev.*, 34, 470 (1986).